



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JUNE MEETING, 1902.

THE stated meeting was held on Thursday, the 12th instant, at three o'clock, P. M.; the President in the chair. The record of the May meeting was read and approved; and the Librarian, the Cabinet-Keeper, and the Corresponding Secretary made their monthly reports.

The PRESIDENT said: —

At the May meeting of the Society the roll of our Resident Membership numbered ninety-eight names. It now numbers ninety-seven. George Bigelow Chase, after a long and trying illness, died at his house in Dedham, Massachusetts, on Monday, 2d instant.

I presume my acquaintance with Mr. Chase, and our friendly relations, antedated considerably those of any other member of the Society. Having known him, more or less intimately, from infancy, we entered the Boston Latin School together, in July, 1848, and left it at the same time, in July, 1851. We again met in 1853, as candidates for admission to Harvard College, and graduated therefrom in the same class, that of 1856. Mr. Chase then devoted himself to business pursuits, while I turned my attention to the study of the law. Our friendly relations, never intimate, were, however, continued until five years later, when I drifted into the army. He remained in Boston, and, when I came back, in the autumn of 1866, I found Mr. Chase married, and living here. Afterwards our paths rarely converged, and, seeing but little of him during the remainder of his life, I saw that little only in a casual way.

The acquaintance thus extended over, perhaps, sixty years. Notwithstanding, I shall, in announcing his death, to-day confine myself to my usual course in such cases, presenting only the facts relating to his connection with this Society, and his work in it.

Mr. Chase, together with Dr. Everett and Senator Lodge among the living, and Fitch Edward Oliver among the dead, might be characterized as our centennial members, in view of the fact that they were the elect of the year 1876. To the few of us who have been of the Society more than twenty-five years, the national centennial does not seem remote; but, in looking over our records for 1876, the interval of time which has since elapsed, emphasized by the names which constantly therein recur, becomes more apparent. For instance, Mr. Winthrop and Mr. Evarts now seem to us men of a bygone generation. Yet Mr. Winthrop presided over our meeting when Mr. Chase was elected; and, at the same time, William M. Evarts, of New York, and John Richard Green, of London, were chosen, respectively, Honorary and Corresponding Members. Mr. Winthrop, Mr. Green, and Mr. Evarts are all gone; and, at the time of Mr. Chase's death, his name in order of seniority stood sixteenth on a roll of ninety-eight.

The first mention of Mr. Chase, in connection with our Society, is in the record of the May meeting of 1870, when, it appears, he, not then being connected with it, presented to us a manuscript copy of an oration delivered by Nathaniel Appleton Haven, Esq., of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, on the two hundredth anniversary of the settlement of that town, May 21, 1823. During the same year he also made other gifts to our Library. He was put upon the Committee to examine the Treasurer's Accounts in March, 1878, serving on the same Committee repeatedly thereafter, often as its chairman; and so it hardly need be said he always took a lively interest in the Society's financial conditions. He was elected a member of the Executive Committee of the Council in 1880; and in April, 1882, as chairman, presented its annual report. On several occasions Mr. Chase was a member of the annual Committee to nominate officers, and at times its chairman. In 1881 his name was added to the Committee on the Publication of Washington Letters; and in October, 1897, he was appointed one of a Committee of four to publish the Pepperrell Papers.

On a number of occasions Mr. Chase took part in the discussions at our meetings, more especially at the May meeting, 1880, when he communicated a diary by Lieutenant-Colonel Eld kept during our war of Independence. Also, in April,

1882, he made a very interesting statement in connection with a copy of the pamphlet report of Daniel Webster's libel suit, in 1828, against Theodore Lyman, Jr., subsequently Mayor of Boston, an outcome of the long controversy between J. Q. Adams and certain representatives of the old Federal party, which continued from 1807 to 1830. At the October meeting, 1884, he favored us with remarks in relation to General Samuel Parsons, a British spy, and also one of the officials of the court which condemned André. In December and January, 1891-92, he communicated certain details in relation to Copley's portrait of Paul Revere. His final contribution was on Gladstone and Joseph Chamberlain, in November, 1900.

At various times Mr. Chase paid tributes to his personal friends among our members, as their deaths occurred: to H. Austin Whitney, in October, 1889; to A. T. Perkins, in May, 1891; to Theodore Lyman, October, 1897; to Clement H. Hill, in January, 1899; and to Mellen Chamberlain, in October, 1900. Mr. Chase was, through his mother, a nephew of the late Chief Justice Bigelow, and, in May, 1878, was appointed to prepare a memoir of his relative. This he presented in 1890.

Between 1891 and 1896 Mr. Chase resided in Europe. During those years his active connection with the Society necessarily ceased; but that he had not lost his interest in it was evinced by a letter which appears in our Proceedings of April, 1894, containing notes of a conversation with two Englishmen he had met, relating to the Northeastern Boundary question.

Eminently a useful member of the Society even as it was, in the case of Mr. Chase the will was not lacking to have made him of yet greater use. Unfortunately, as I have already mentioned, he was absent from the country many years, and, after his return home, his health did not permit of close or active application.

The Treasurer, Mr. CHARLES C. SMITH, having been called on, said:—

More than one hundred and fifty of those who were Resident Members of this Society thirty-five years ago, when I was honored with an election into it, or who have since been

added to our number, have finished their labors here; but I have seldom risen to take part in the commemorative tributes which have so often anticipated other business. I cannot, however, allow the name of George B. Chase to be erased from the roll of living members without adding a word of remembrance to what you, Mr. President, have said. Mr. Chase was elected nearly ten years after I was made a member, but from that time our relations were more than ordinarily intimate. Ten times he was an auditor of the Treasurer's accounts, — a task, I need scarcely say, for which he was peculiarly fitted, and in which he took a special interest. Three or four times he served with not less fidelity on publishing committees; and only a few weeks before his death he wrote to me from his sick-chamber in regard to a biographical note which it was desired to insert in the forthcoming volume of Trumbull Papers. Five times he was a member of the Council. He was always constant in his attendance at the meetings of the Council and of the Society; and he frequently gave us offhand some bit of unfamiliar information about a matter which he personally remembered, or about which he had had exceptional opportunities for acquiring accurate knowledge. His most important contribution to our Proceedings was the memoir of his uncle, Chief Justice Bigelow, published in April, 1890. Besides this memoir he made numerous other valuable and interesting communications; and he would no doubt have enriched our pages to a greater extent if he had not been prevented from doing so by his protracted residence in Europe. In all the work of the Society and in its future prospects he was deeply interested. There has seldom, if ever, been a more genial and agreeable companion here, and no one who knew him well can help feeling that something of brightness and cheer has gone out of life, — that something of sympathy and kindly fellowship will henceforth be missing.

Of his services elsewhere, as an efficient Trustee of the Boston Public Library for nine years, as a member of the New England Historic-Genealogical Society for more than thirty years, and of the monographs which he occasionally printed, this is not the time nor the place to speak at length. Genealogical researches were always attractive to him, and in them he did not a little good work, of which it will remain for

his biographer to take account. Through all the vicissitudes of a business life he kept unchilled his fondness for antiquarian studies and his taste for the best literature. In this Society he will be long remembered, not only for what he did, but scarcely less for what he was as an associate and friend.

Hon. D. H. CHAMBERLAIN spoke substantially as follows :—

Mr. President, — I rise with great diffidence to say a single word on this occasion. My acquaintance with Mr. Chase was so brief and slight that I can lay no claim to such knowledge of him as would ordinarily warrant public estimate or characterization of him. My personal observation has, however, happened to be supplemented by the knowledge and opinions of others, so that I myself seemed to see in him much that my unaided observation and acquaintance might not have seen.

To me he seemed, first of all, a genial gentleman, full of the fruits of large experience with the world and of association with the best representatives of the social and literary culture of his time. I have called him genial. I mean by this only that his heart was warm towards those whom he deemed worthy of his regard. His manner was reserved, not to say cold. But his feeling was generous, sympathetic, appreciative, and free of all narrow prejudice, of all petty envy or jealousy. His experience had made him cautious in his intercourse and reserved in his utterances; but under the exterior of a cool, undemonstrative man, I always found a warm heart and a sympathetic mind.

Mr. Chase's own estimate of himself was characteristically modest, I think too modest. He loved to place all his praise and enthusiasm on others; and if they were his friends his measured estimate often became the glowing tribute of enthusiasm.

Mr. Chase was, however, critical, keenly so. He admired only good work, solid performance. For merely showy or brilliant qualities he had but little regard. He knew what was good work. He had done it himself. I recall the genuine satisfaction with which he once said to me that he had done one piece of work — his "Lowndes of South Carolina" — which would not need to be done again, — an opin-

ion shared, I think, by all who have had occasion to know that work.

His imperfect and failing health during all the time I knew him personally kept him from the active participation in our proceedings which he desired; but he was keenly observant of all that passed here. I have known no member whose interest was more constant or more intelligent. His welcome to me here was so cordial, his suggestions regarding our Society and the duties of its members were so disinterested, so wise, and so valuable that a large vacancy is left for me by his departure, and I have really wished by the few words I have spoken, to give to others my sense of his great personal worth, his high standards of life, and his generous interest in the things for which our Society stands.

Mr. GAMALIEL BRADFORD spoke extemporaneously, in substance as follows:—

In speaking of one phase of Historic Evolution in Massachusetts, I shall have to begin a long way off in space and a long way back in time.

When the Western Empire of Rome went down under the invasions from the north and east, Europe was covered with a mass of more or less barbarous tribes, fighting for existence, with every man's hand against every other's. In this ocean of misery the only ark of refuge was the Roman Catholic Church, and the only oases were the monasteries. The first step towards social organization was in the feudal system, when the great nobles, making war on each other and robbing and oppressing peaceful citizens, at least furnished some protection to their own followers and retainers. Relief from this still intolerable evil was sought in a combination of the peoples, chiefly those resident in cities, to aid one of the strongest fighters to put down all the others, and exercise their personal protection over a wider field. This took place over all Europe within two or three centuries: under the Tudors in England, Louis XI. to Richelieu and Louis XIV. in France, Ferdinand and Isabella in Spain, the Ivans in Russia, the Hapsburgs in Austria. In two countries circumstances of the greatest historical interest prevented this. In Germany and Italy that has been taking place, with modified results and

processes, in the nineteenth century, which was done elsewhere in Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth into the seventeenth.

The next political development was in the establishment of representative bodies to hold in check the too powerful executive which had grown up, — an institution of which Greece and Rome knew practically nothing, and which has made the English government, as having been the field of its real evolution, perhaps the most valuable which the world has seen.

This so-called parliamentary government reached the highest point of success, thus far attained, in the middle of the nineteenth century, with the first parliamentary reform in England, the revolutions of 1830 in France and Belgium, that of 1848 extending its influence to Germany, Italy, and Austria, the wonderful development of prosperity in the United States, the expulsion of Spain from America ; all these things had so excited men's minds that they thought the millennium had really come, and that all human ills were to be cured by the organized representation of universal suffrage.

The nineteenth century closed, however, upon a less hopeful state of mind. The political developments in the United States, the British war in South Africa, the Franco-Prussian war, the rage for colonial conquest, the crushing of Europe under the weight of military armaments, the growing international jealousies, the apparent impotence of legislatures, are causing many head shakings among serious writers in all countries, and grave doubts whether elective representation of universal suffrage is not doomed to failure, with the alternative of recurrence to military force, but without the benefits, such as they were, of a hereditary and trained aristocracy.

Probably it must be admitted that the depression of such thinkers is as much too great now as their exaltation was fifty years ago. But there can be no doubt that very serious questions are presenting themselves. And none is more important than this, whether the troubles that threaten us are chargeable to universal suffrage, that distinctly new product of the nineteenth century, or to the organization of government and its adaptation to this new and enormous force. This review of history shows that the improved conditions of modern life have been at least coeval with changes in methods of government, and at least encourage the hope that some of that scien-

tific study which has resulted in such vast material progress may be applied with advantage to the most important science of all, that of enabling men to live together in peace.

That which is only gradually coming to be understood is that the danger from legislatures is quite as great as that from executive power. There is a curious chain of evidence as to this. I will quote first from a work of M. Dupriez, a Brussels lawyer, entitled "*Les Ministres dans les principaux Pays d'Europe et d'Amérique*," Paris, 1892 : —

"The law-maker can enumerate in a text the rights of the great political powers, regulate their organization up to a certain point, determine the exterior form of their action ; he is powerless to control the exact position of authority which each shall possess. That is a question which can be decided only by the relative strength of the several powers. The constitutional usages alone establish a result of the struggle which inevitably arises between them."

It would be hardly possible to condense more perfectly in one paragraph the political history of the United States.

The next witness will be Mr. Walter Bagehot, one of the most acute exponents of the "English Constitution," though he seems to have comprehended very imperfectly that of the United States : —

"A legislative chamber is greedy and covetous ; it acquires as much, it concedes as little as possible. The passions of its members are its rulers ; the law-making faculty, the most comprehensive of the imperial faculties, is its instrument ; it will take the administration, if it can take it."

Note next how strikingly Madison in the Convention of 1787 had furnished the illustration of this remark three quarters of a century before : —

"Experience proves a tendency in our governments to throw all power into the legislative vortex. The executives of the States are little more than ciphers ; the legislatures are omnipotent. If no effectual check be devised on the encroachments of the latter, a revolution will be inevitable."

Again, in the "Federalist" Madison says with reference to the State constitutions : —

"The legislative department is everywhere extending the sphere of its activity and drawing all powers into its impetuous vortex. The

founders of our republics seem never to have recollected the danger from legislative usurpations, which by assembling all power in the same hands must lead to the same tyranny as is threatened by executive usurpations."

And he quotes from Jefferson's "Notes on Virginia" the following passage relative to the same defects in the Virginia constitution: —

"All the powers of the government — legislative, executive, and judicial — result to the same legislative body. The concentrating these in the same hands is precisely the definition of despotic government. It will be no alleviation that these powers will be exercised by a plurality of hands and not by a single one."

With reference to the President's veto, Judge Story remarks: —

"There is a natural tendency in the legislative department to intrude upon the rights and absorb the powers of the other departments of government. A mere parchment delineation of the boundaries of each is wholly insufficient for the protection of the weaker branch, as the executive unquestionably is, and hence there arises a constitutional necessity of arming it with powers for its own defence. If the executive did not possess this qualified negative, he would be gradually stripped of all his authority, and would become, what it is well known the governors of some States are, a mere pageant and shadow of magistracy."

If time would permit, it would be easy to show that the veto has failed, and must completely fail, to accomplish the purpose here set forth.

Thus far we have considered the theory of government by a legislature. It may be well to compare the teachings of practice in history. The first prominent case is that of the Long Parliament in England, probably as good a body of men as could be found in the country. The war against the crown came to an end in 1646. Seven years more sufficed to bring the king to the scaffold, and the country, through the anarchy and the impotence of parliament under the military despotism of Cromwell. More than a century later the French Revolution repeated the story. The legislature, grasping all power but impotent, beheaded the king, and within ten years handed over the country to the despotism of Napoleon. There is something very striking in the parallelism of the two histories.

The death of Cromwell, like the captivity of Napoleon, both

illustrating the fatal defect of despotism in providing no successor, brought back the old royal family. Charles X. succeeding Louis XVIII. corresponded in character as well as circumstances to James II. succeeding Charles. The revolution of July, like that of 1688, changed the succession by bringing in a collateral branch. But here the parallel ends. England, secured by the sea from foreign invasion and freed from the domination of an alien church, worked out the whole modern parliamentary system with executive responsibility, parliamentary reform, and the absence from her soil of anything worse than a riot for one hundred and sixty years. France has alternated between anarchy and despotism, and while the third Republic has demonstrated during thirty years not only the desire of the French people for peace, order, and good government, but their capacity for self-government, the supremacy of the legislature, in whose hands the president is only a cipher, which sets up and pulls down ministries at its pleasure and makes the finances, that keystone of all government, the sport of its faction and caprice, gives warning that the fatal constitutional disease has not yet been eradicated from her system.

We will now return to the history of Massachusetts, to which the foregoing sketch is pertinent, as showing how exactly the same principles operate under differing circumstances. The Constitution of this State, dating from 1780, is to me, in its transparent and unconscious simplicity, one of the most amusing historical documents in existence. From the date of the second charter in 1692, the colony was under governors appointed from England. The history of the next eighty years was of one long struggle for power between the governor and the Assembly. It was hardly surprising, therefore, that a constitutional convention, made up of the same material as the legislature, should have shown precisely the same jealousy towards a governor to be elected by the people, and have taken the greatest precaution to bind him hand and foot.

Their own common sense told them that, if they were to have a governor at all, he must be somebody at least in appearance, so they dressed him up and put a feather in his cap:—

“There shall be a supreme executive magistrate, who shall be styled — THE GOVERNOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS; and whose title shall be — HIS EXCELLENCY.”

But to give him any real power was quite another question. The ball and chain must be attached at the outset:—

“There shall be a council for advising the governor in the executive part of the government, to consist of nine [eight] persons besides the Lieutenant-Governor, whom the governor, for the time being, shall have full power and authority from time to time at his discretion to assemble and call together; and the governor, with the said councilors, or five of them, at least, shall and may from time to time hold and keep a council for the ordering and directing the affairs of the commonwealth, according to the laws of the land.”

Note the plenitude of power given to the governor “from time to time to call the council together,” and that to the council, and not the governor, is given the power “of ordering and directing the affairs of the commonwealth,” whatever that extremely indefinite phrase may mean:—

“The governor, and in his absence, the lieutenant-governor, shall be president of the council, but shall have no vote in council.”

It seems almost like intentional sarcasm, that the supreme executive magistrate should not have a vote in this body of nine men, who, elected separately from him and from each other, have by a majority vote at least a negative upon anything he may propose.

What, in the next place, is the administrative power of the governor?

“The secretary, treasurer, and receiver-général, auditor, and attorney-general [that is to say, all the executive heads of departments] shall be chosen annually on the day in November prescribed for the choice of governor.”

Thus these officials, all separately elected, are completely independent of the governor and of each other, and no one can interfere, unless by way of advice, with any other or with his subordinates. They are merely clerks to carry out as well as they can the commands of the legislature. It means a paralysis of administration almost as complete as if in the human body the nerves were cut off close to the brain; that there is not an officer in the State, except, perhaps, his private secretary and his personal staff, to whom the governor can give an order with any power of enforcing obedience.

It is sadly true that the most imposing part of executive power is always the military side, and though since the Union it has in the States been chiefly a matter of form, its existence was none the less real.

The captains and subalterns of the militia are elected by the privates, the field officers by the captains and subalterns, the brigadiers by the field officers, "and such officers, so elected, shall be commissioned by the governor," to all appearance a pure piece of clerical work:—

"The major-generals shall be appointed by the Senate and House of Representatives, each having a negative upon the other, and be commissioned by the governor."

It seems a singular way of arriving at military efficiency.

The commanding officers of regiments shall appoint their adjutants and quartermasters, the brigadiers their brigade majors, and the major-generals their aids; and the governor shall appoint the adjutant-general.

Here, at last, is one man appointed by the governor, which is probably the reason why that officer takes such a prominent part in any military movements in the State.

If history teaches one lesson, it is that a military force which elects its own officers is of no real value for its ostensible purpose. The National Guard of France has during a century afforded a disastrous demonstration of the truth of this proposition. The State militias have hardly been put to any crucial test as yet, but the first battle of Bull Run threw a partial light on the question, especially as the same material, when placed under regular officers and subjected to systematic discipline, soon showed itself equal to any troops in the world.

It is interesting to read the functions imposed upon the governor, with this instrument of at least doubtful efficiency:—

"He shall have full power to train, instruct, exercise, and govern the militia and navy; and for the special defence and safety of the commonwealth to assemble in martial array, and put in warlike posture the inhabitants thereof, and to lead and conduct them, and with them to encounter, repel, resist, expel, and pursue by force of arms, as well by sea as by land, within or without the limits of this commonwealth, and also to kill, slay, and destroy,"

and so on for more than half a page. And all these powers are to be exercised

“agreeably to the rules and regulations of the constitution and the laws of the land [that is, with his hands tied] and not otherwise.”

The actual and definite powers of the governor are two and two only : —

1. With advice of council, he shall have full power and authority during the session of the General Court to adjourn or prorogue the same to any time the two houses may desire ;

2. The power of pardoning offences . . . shall be in the governor, by and with the advice of the council, in which body, be it remembered, the governor has no vote.

So much for the administrative side. What is the governor's relation to legislation ? It may be said at once that he has no relation at all to it until the acts passed are presented to him in final shape for his acceptance or rejection. He can put into his messages any recommendations he pleases, but the legislature is not bound to, and seldom does, pay any attention to them. Now it seems plain enough that no government, any more than any business of any kind, can be carried on successfully by means of executive negatives. Suppose the case of a railway corporation, in which the general manager sat apart by himself, with no voice as to the conduct of its affairs, till the directors, acting by themselves, had devised plans for time-tables, running of trains, rates of freight and passage, maintenance of road bed and rolling-stock, and so on, and these were presented for his simple acceptance or rejection. It is often said, and with entire truth, that the government of a State should be conducted on business principles. In point of fact in this State it proceeds upon a glaring defiance of the most ordinary, fundamental and elementary principles of business.

Read, *per contra*, in Article IV., Part II., Chapter I., Section I. of the Constitution, the vast and practically unlimited power granted to the legislature ; remember that this was proposed by a constitutional convention, made up of the same material as the legislature and without the intervention of any executive authority ; and then, comparing what has been said of the tendency of all legislatures, judge of the results which were likely to follow.

Article XXX., and the last, of the Declaration of Rights runs thus : —

"In the government of this commonwealth the legislative department shall never exercise the executive and judicial power or either of them; the executive shall never exercise the legislative and judicial power or either of them; the judicial shall never exercise the legislative and executive power or either of them."

It is curious that there is nowhere any definition of the limits thus peremptorily ordered to be observed. The functions of each branch are laid down in a general way, which is far from containing any exact division of them. It may be, and often is, said that this was not possible. But, then, what was the use of putting in the injunction? It was certain that there would be a conflict of powers, and certain, also, that the strongest of them would prevail; and these words merely recognize that certainty, with a mild deprecation of the conflict, itself thoroughly characteristic of the view which was taken of the new government coming into existence.

But the climax of the article is in the concluding clause, "to the end it may be a government of laws and not of men."

Since the world began has anybody ever heard of, or can anybody imagine, a government of laws alone without the intervention of men? Of course, it is plain enough that what was meant is, that it should be a government under a system of law, and not by the arbitrary caprice of individuals; but the words themselves have been constantly used to justify the exclusive government of the legislature, because an impersonal body makes laws and puts them in operation, while to intrust any real power to the executive would be to introduce the forbidden government of men.

I might go on to point out the results of these precedents upon the actual condition of Massachusetts, the operation of the same principles in other States, and how far these have made their appearance in the momentous relation of the federal government to the States. That, however, would be to enter upon the field of politics, and within these sacred precincts only the muse of history has a ticket of admission.

I might, again, supposing that premises and conclusion have both been correctly established, consider by what means the consequences, which by the logic of history may be expected to follow, could be averted. But this, by its excursion into politics, would be only plunging still deeper into the abyss of criminal

transgression. I shall have to rest satisfied with the hope that I may have in some slight degree contributed to your entertainment on an idle summer afternoon.

Hon. WILLIAM W. CRAPO reminded the Society that three hundred years ago to-day Bartholomew Gosnold and his fellow voyagers were in the occupancy of the island of Cuttyhunk, which lies at the entrance of Buzzard's Bay. The little barque "Concord" hailing from Dartmouth, England, whose ship's company consisted of four officers, eight seamen, and twenty planters, or "gentlemen adventurers" as one account styles them, sailed from Falmouth, on the 26th day of March, 1602. After passing the Azores the first land sighted was Cape Cod. Cruising westward along the coast on the 24th of May (O. S.), the "Concord" dropped her anchor within a quarter of a mile of the shore of Cuttyhunk in eight fathoms of water. Here Gosnold and his companions remained several weeks, making explorations of the neighboring islands and the mainland.

From the narratives of Gilbert Archer, who was rated on the ship's papers as "gentleman and journalist," and from the report made by John Brereton to Sir Walter Raleigh, may be drawn the impressions of the voyagers. They were charmed with the glimpse they had obtained of the new world. They had discovered a land which they pronounced beautiful and fruitful and healthful. The body of water where the "Concord," rode at anchor was described as a stately sound. "It is the stateliest sound," says Archer, "I was ever in," an estimate which no one familiar with Buzzard's Bay will dispute. With evident pleasure they found the red and white strawberries which were "as sweet and much bigger than those in England"; there were many springs of excellent sweet water, great store of deer and other beasts and divers fowls in great plenty. In the words of Archer they feasted and grew fat upon the young sea fowl which they found in their nests upon the banks and low trees.

The adventurers were delighted with the climate, the beauty of the country, and the fertility of the soil. The native inhabitants are described as of tall stature, comely proportions, strong, active, and some of good years indicating a very healthful condition. Brereton says of them that they were exceed-

ingly courteous, gentle of disposition, and well conditioned, excelling all others that they had seen.

The wholesomeness of the climate was the subject of much favorable comment. The narrative says "their health and strength all the while they remained there so renewed and increased that not one of the Company felt the least inclination to any disease or sickness, but all were much fatter and in better health than when they went out of England."

The soil is described as fat and lusty. In mid-May, the account says, they did sow for trial in sundry places, wheat, barley, oats, and peas which in fourteen days were sprung up nine inches and more.

What evidently gave them greatest satisfaction was the sassafras in great plenty all the island over, — a tree, says the journalist, of high price and profit.

Gosnold on landing found on the island of Cuttyhunk a pond of fresh water, in circuit about two miles, on one side not thirty yards distant from the sea, "in the centre of which is a rocky islet, containing an acre of ground full of wood." On the little islet he immediately began a fort and place of abode. The location was admirable for purposes of defence and precaution against surprise. This structure was the first erected by Europeans on the New England coast. It was sufficient in size to harbor twenty persons at least with their necessary provisions.

The voyage evidently was undertaken as a commercial venture. Its purpose was discovery in the hope of commercial gain. It was the intention of Gosnold to remain with the major part of the voyagers, sending back the "Concord" under the command of Captain Gilbert, and a division of the provisions was made and a portion carried ashore. But a controversy arose. When not working on the fort, the men had been digging sassafras roots, and such was the quantity accumulated it was believed the division of profits from its sale would be large. Some who were to remain became suspicious that Captain Gilbert would not deal fairly by them in the accounting or would not bring back their share of the proceeds, and there was wrangling. The record says the "ill-disposed persons overthrew the stay there."

The "Concord," laden with sassafras roots and with cedar and skins and furs and other commodities gathered during their

stay, sailed from Cuttyhunk, June 18th (O. S.) with the entire ship's company, and reached Exmouth on the 23d of July.

On the 4th of the present June, which in modern chronology is the anniversary of Gosnold's landing on Cuttyhunk, a few gentlemen from New Bedford and Boston went to the island and placed a stone, suitably inscribed, on the spot where had been erected the fort and habitation three hundred years before. It is further proposed to commemorate this first attempt of an English settlement in New England by a monument or tower to be erected during this summer. A considerable portion of the funds required has been obtained. It is the wish of the persons engaged in this work that a deed conveying to the Massachusetts Historical Society the title to the little islet in the fresh-water pond on which the monument will stand may be accepted by the Society. This acceptance of title will not involve any charge or expense to the Society. If this shall be done, it will connect the earliest historical society of America with the first definite fact in New England history. Gosnold's stay at Cuttyhunk was brief, but it is recognized as the pioneer movement leading to the introduction of English civilization into the vast wilderness of this Western Continent. The event thus becomes one of highest historical significance.

Mr. Crapo further suggested, in the event that present plans are carried to success in the erection of the proposed monument and in commemorative tercentennial exercises, that representatives from this Society attend such exercises in behalf of the Society.

The PRESIDENT spoke briefly of the interest attaching to Gosnold's voyage, and Dr. SAMUEL A. GREEN gave an account of a visit which he made to Cuttyhunk many years ago.

Mr. MELVILLE M. BIGELOW read some portions of a paper on the constitutional questions between 1761 and 1776, which led up to the Declaration of American Independence.

Voted, That the stated meetings for July, August, and September be omitted, the President and Recording Secretary to have power to call a special meeting, if necessary.

Hon. D. H. Chamberlain was appointed to prepare the Memoir of the late George B. Chase for publication in the Proceedings.

Brief remarks were also made during the meeting by Messrs. HENRY F. JENKS and HENRY W. HAYNES.

A new serial, containing the record of the March, April, and May meetings, and a bound volume of the Proceedings from March, 1901, to February, 1902, both inclusive, were ready for delivery at this meeting.